1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA	
3		
4		
5	In re: ) Civil 05-MD-1708 (DWF/AJB)	
6	)	
7 8	GUIDANT CORPORATION ) STATUS CONFERENCE IMPLANTABLE DEFIBRILLATOR ) PRODUCTS LIABILITY ) LITIGATION, )	
9	)	
10 11	This Document Relates ) To All Actions ) 9:15 o'clock, a.m. ) February 21, 2007	
12	) St. Paul, Minnesota	
13		
14		
15		
16	THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN W. FRANK	
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGES	
18	STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDING	
19		
20		
21	* * *	
22		
23	JEANNE M. ANDERSON  Registered Merit Reporter	
24	Suite 646, 316 North Robert Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	
25	(651) 848-1221	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3		
4	LEAD PLAINTIFF COUNSEL	:
5		
6		Richard Arsenault, Esq.
7		Neblett, Beard & Arsenault 2200 Bonaventure Court
8		Alexandria, LA 71301 (318) 487-9874
9		(313) 131 3311
10		
11	And	
12		
13		Elizabeth Cabraser, Esq.
14		Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Berstein, LLP
15		275 Battery Street, 30th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
16		(415) 956-1000
17		
18	And	
19		
20		Charles S. Zimmerman, Esq.
21		Zimmerman Reed 651 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501
22		Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123 (612) 341-0400
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	
3	PLAINTIFF LIAISON COUNSEL:
4	
5	Charles S. Zimmerman, Esq. Zimmerman Reed
6	651 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501
7	Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123 (612) 341-0400
8	
9	* * *
10	
11	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Robert R. Hopper, Esq.
12	Zimmerman Reed 651 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501
13	Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123 (612) 341-0400
14	7 · · · · · ·
15	And
16	Silvija A. Strikis, Esq. Kellogg, Huber, Hansen
17	Todd, Evans & Figel, PLLC
18	Sumner Square 1615 M Street, N.W.
19	Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20036
20	(202) 326-7939
21	And
22	
23	Nicholas J. Drakulich, Esq. Jennings & Drakulich LLP
24	2002 Jimmy Durante Boulevard Suite 400
25	Del Mar, California 92014 (858) 755-5887

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	
3	LEAD DEFENDANT COUNSEL:
4	Timetha A Danth Egg
5	Timothy A. Pratt, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP
6	2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-6550
7	(816) 474-6550
8	
9	
10	LIAISON DEFENDANT COUNSEL:
11	
12	Joseph M. Price, Esq. Faegre & Benson
13	2200 Wells Fargo Center 90 South 7th Street
14	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3901 (612) 766-7000
15	
16	
17	* * *
18	
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
20	
21	Deborah A. Moeller, Esq. Andrew D. Carpenter, Esq.
22	Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard
23	Kansas City, MO 64108-6550 (816) 474-6550
24	
25	
-	

(In open court.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Thank you.

You know, Lowell Lindquist, it is his birthday today and
he won't acknowledge which birthday it is, but --

THE CLERK: It's sixty years old.

THE COURT: For those of you that are as old as some of us, he got this card from his family. And he thought we should do this instead of all rise in the future (music played from a greeting card). "Bad to the bone." (Laughter.)

And believe me, we have had some hearings recently where that might be entirely appropriate. And there were some people bad to the bone, but I won't specify who they were.

So, on a serious note, despite Lowell's birthday, and my judicial assistant is gone on vacation on her first cruise of her life, so we are trying to struggle away back there and run the chambers.

We can proceed with the agenda. The next two meetings are set, the 4th and the 25th of April, I believe. And there's some motions scheduled between now and then. For example, in early March, there may be some -- not modifications of date, but I think there is one motion set for -- is it March 6th?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: 6th.

morning. I think it is set later in the morning, if that would be agreeable. But, we will discuss that between now and then and get it -- roll it up on the website. That way I have a reason to do it to talk to Judge Boylan and to get more out of the day that day with some other issues related to the MDL.

So, with that, we can proceed with the -- yes, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: All in St. Paul, as I believe?

THE COURT: Yes, right now they are scheduled in St. Paul. I know that is not entirely popular.

There is one reason to do it, apart from kind of the cramped quarters; and that is, of course, not necessarily at each meeting, but oftentimes, then, you head for Ramsey County with Judge Leary.

We have tried to coordinate some of those days. But, if there be a change -- right now the trials are all set to be in Minneapolis that are set when we start rolling them out in July. And those are set for Minneapolis. And probably much of the pretrial activity may be here, unless we note otherwise. And we will certainly agree on that. But, I think we have agreed that each trial each month may not be tried in the same courtroom, but they will all be tried in the Federal

Courthouse in Minneapolis. But, we will do our best to minimize the delay, getting them up on the website, any changes in the schedule.

We can proceed with the agenda. I just assume, whether it is from Plaintiffs' side of the aisle or Defendant's, that if there are individuals you wish to introduce, or even though we get together on a regular basis, that people won't be bashful about doing that. So --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Charles Zimmerman for the Lead Counsel and the PSC.

We have filed with Your Honor a joint agenda for the status conference February 21, 2007. And we also just completed an in-chambers Lead Counsel preliminary conference with Your Honor.

And we will start by going through the agenda, and then the issues that come up that we need to discuss before Your Honor that might be buried within the agenda, but maybe not fully disclosed as items within the agenda, we will raise.

But, as a preliminary matter, there is nothing before Your Honor today that we are going to actually argue. There are no motions to argue today. It is a real status conference in the real true sense of the word status.

THE COURT: And I should note, and maybe it is on no one's mind but mine, if somebody was looking at the kiosk as they came into the building and saw a case for motion this afternoon with one of the parties as Guidant, it is unrelated to the MDL, entirely.

I had that question asked earlier in the week. Well, there is a, quote, "Guidant" motion or motions on in the p.m.. It is unrelated to the MDL, entirely, so --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Just as a matter of information, Your Honor, the trial team from both sides met and conferred yesterday at two o'clock for a few hours to resolve or attempt to resolve matters having to do with the upcoming trials that are set for the middle of July.

We have issues that we want to discuss with Your Honor. And Your Honor has agreed to meet with us immediately following this conference with the respective trial teams to work out trial issues like questionnaires and voir dires and chess clock and timing and things like that.

So, we are not going to go into that, Your Honor, today in this status before you now, we are going to deal with that in chambers to see if we can come up with agreement. If we can't get agreement, I trust the

Court will give us direction and we will move forward with that and we will communicate those parameters once they are set. At this point, they are in meet and confer and discussion.

THE COURT: And I might just observe that just because it is an MDL, if there are lawyers or parties who are saying: Well, with or without the meet and confer and talking about trial administration issues and the order of things and the policy of the Court, how will we know how it is going to be handled?

Well, at some point, sooner rather than later, there will be a Pretrial Order like we do in all -- most of us do in this District in all civil cases. And we will roll something out when it is appropriate to do so, whether it is by Court decision or agreement or a combination of the two, that will be rolled out in the form of an order. And it will be placed on the web. So, there won't be any mystery to how the trials are going to be conducted and the rules of engagement. So --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And we also direct everybody to Pretrial 25 and the amendment to 25, which is currently the structure or, excuse me, the deadlines for certain matters having to do with the trials. And that is the current order of

1 the Court. 2 THE COURT: I don't know, have I rolled that -- I don't believe we have got the most recent 3 4 change out on the web. MR. ZIMMERMAN: I did get it off ECF. 5 THE COURT: Oh, you did. 6 7 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, it was entered and filed. 8 9 THE COURT: I actually was thinking if we got 10 it on the website, yet. MR. ZIMMERMAN: I don't know about the 11 12 website, but we got it off ECF. 13 THE COURT: Anyone in the room, whether you 14 are here on your own behalf or someone else's, well, we haven't read the order yet, but I wonder if the Judge 15 16 has changed with or without agreement, the schedule. The answer is no. 17 18 What won't be apparent, unless you sat back 19 and read through it, really, what was driving some of 20 the, what I will call, minor amendments is leaving ample 21 time for any decisions that weren't made off the bench, 22 so that they wouldn't interfere with the existing trial 23 schedule. That is really what drove it. And I think it 24 would be accurate to say we all agreed to the changes, 25 so --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: So, without further, Your Honor, we will go to number one on the agenda which is the status of cases filed in Federal Court and transferred into the MDL.

Normally Mr. Pratt gives this as he has the most up-to-date statistics. And then we will comment after he gives us the statistics if we have other comments.

MR. PRATT: Good morning, Your Honor, Tim

Pratt for Guidant. There are currently a total of 1,230

cases pending against Guidant in the United States.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Did you say, 1,230?

MR. PRATT: Yes, sir. The number of cases in Federal Court is 1,145. The number of cases in State Court is 85. That brings us to the total of 1,230 cases.

Of the Federal Court cases filed, there are 1,102 already here, transferred or filed directly.

There are 43 pending MDL transfers before the judicial panel. That is where we stand.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: We really have no comment on that, Your Honor, other than we recognize that these numbers are increasing. And we know there are other cases in inventory out there, but this is what is filed

```
before Your Honor, and this is the mix between State and
1
2
    Federal Court.
                MR. BECNEL: Bucky, I filed 37 cases this
 3
4
    morning. The Court is working on them.
                THE COURT:
                           Keep those cards and letters
 5
6
    coming in, I guess, is what we say.
7
                MR. BECNEL: By the way, Your Honor, I would
8
    like just to reserve, based on your recent ruling about
    having filed them individually -- I would like to
9
10
    reserve -- I am not asking for an interlocutory appeal
11
    on that particular order, but we have two converging
12
    orders.
13
                THE COURT: I don't know that the effect of
    my Order is to require individual -- I think I was
14
15
    whining in the Order, if we started at the beginning, I
16
    might have done that. But, I don't believe that the
    effect of the Order that I have is to require these to
17
18
    be individually filed. We will take that up --
19
                MR. BECNEL:
                             I filed all of these
20
    individually, because Medtronics is a little bit
21
    different.
22
                THE COURT:
                            That is true.
23
                MR. BECNEL:
                             I want to reserve my objection
24
    in case it applies. I wish I would have saved myself a
25
    whole bunch of money this morning.
```

1 THE COURT: We have not required to have them 2 filed individually. 3 MR. BECNEL: I figured you were going to be 4 remanding me right after the July trial dates, anyhow, 5 so --MR. ZIMMERMAN: Um --6 7 MR. BECNEL: But, let me just reserve that 8 just --9 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Why don't you do it now, 10 Danny? Why don't you go --11 THE COURT: Go right ahead. Because the 12 order that we have, Pretrial Order 27, while I will 13 acknowledge that at the outset I would have required that I did not -- this order does not require you to 14 individually file them. 15 16 MR. BECNEL: Your Honor, the main reason I am concerned about this issue is some of the lawyers here 17 18 have enough wealth to be able to pay these Court costs. 19 Many of the people do not. They are on fixed income tax 20 with Medicare. And if you require them, like a lot of 21 lawyers do, to pay their court costs up front, then you 22 have got to get into a lot of the in forma pauperis type 23 of requirements and with deadlines looming all over the 24 place, I want to try to protect the record -- not so 25 much just in this case, but in all MDL's because of

those very facts. Thank you very much, Your Honor, I would like to.

THE COURT: Maybe we should -- because my Order does not require them to be filed individually. That is what I think probably should happen at the outset, and then work out some agreement on the filing fees, so that everybody is treated the same across the board. But, I will reserve and note what you said, because I have similar concerns.

MR. BECNEL: Thank you very much.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: The next item, Your Honor, is a representative trial process update. There are a number of issues contained within that, all of which we briefly previewed with Your Honor in chambers, and we are going to discuss at greater length.

I am not sure it adds to the mix to discuss them, because they are moving targets and open at this point in time. I am happy to recite what those issues are if the Court desires or if people in the courtroom desire, but the purpose of our meeting after this is to discuss these and to try and reach clarity on where we are going with them. Because right now we just have some differing nuances and points of view. And I'm not sure it will be helpful to just say Plaintiffs' position on, say, the Markert Deposition or discovery is this and

the Defendant's position on Higgins is that. I would prefer if we could vet it before you in chambers in our next session, see where we are, and if we have motions that are going to come from that or proceedings that have to occur as a result of that, we have them and post them appropriately. But, we can do it any way you want.

THE COURT: For my part, I mean, I am always interested to err on the side of full disclosure. But having said that, since I don't see any issue that was suggested to me this morning that is going to adversely or otherwise affect anybody in the immediate future -- and in fact some of these issues may be resolved with or without court decision and intervention, unless counsel sees it differently, I don't know that it would serve any purpose to roll any of these issues out.

Mr. Pratt, do you?

MR. PRATT: My view is consistent with yours and Mr. Zimmerman's.

I think there are lots of issues that need to be put on the table for discussion. The goal here is to get these cases streamlined and ready for trial in July. We are working, I think, closely and working very well with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in that regard.

I think there may be a time when they become more substantive and certainly deserve a more open

discussion. I think right now some of it is how we can put these trials together better, how we can finish discovery more efficiently. I tend to agree for this purpose that we will just reserve this for further discussion after this conference, and maybe next month give sort of a report on where we are.

THE COURT: And I -- to my knowledge, nothing has happened that would require some update, in fairness. I mean, there is nothing happening officially or unofficially. Because if I thought so, I would err on the side of disclosing it, some of what is said about me, well, when Frank is in the courtroom, he doesn't even have an unspoken word. It comes all out in the courtroom. I will let somebody else decide if that is true or not.

But, anyway, in all seriousness, I think that is the best use of our time. Because I don't know of any particular issue that in fairness would require us to kind of just outline for those of you in the courtroom.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: The other issues, Your Honor, which would also fold in the same way, which is proposed revisions to PTO 25, we have exchanged proposals for PTO 25 deadlines.

PTO 25 are the Court's deadlines for the

bellwether trials. And we have exchanged proposals to amend those in various ways to try and streamline the process and give dates consistent with what the trial lawyers think will be their respective needs.

We are planning on discussing that with Your Honor in chambers, again. We had a good discussion on it yesterday, and I don't think that there is any need to have any further discussion on it, except we hope we will get them resolved or nailed down by the end of the day today.

So, with regard to number 2 and 3, they really fold together and are contained within the remarks that both Mr. Pratt and I made about vetting this further in chambers and reporting where we are at the end of the day.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Number 4, Your Honor, is update on the discovery process. The only thing I guess I would report there is the back-up tape issue, which I think we are toward the end of the resolution discussion on that. We don't have it completely resolved. I don't know if Andy and Sylvia want to give any kind of update on the record at all for that?

MR. CARPENTER: Sure, would be happy to.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: That one has been at play for

1 a while and we are right at the end of the line on that. 2 MR. CARPENTER: Your Honor, Andy Carpenter for Guidant. 3 I think we are, after many months of 4 negotiating this issue, pretty close to getting it 5 resolved. Plaintiffs gave us a written proposal in a 6 7 letter last week which basically focused the inquiry 8 that we do through the back-up tapes. We are in the process, actually winding up the process of evaluating 9 10 that. I think it is close to something we can agree to with some proposed modified language on our part, but I 11 12 am optimistic we will get this resolved and done fairly 13 shortly. I can provide any additional detail the Court or anybody wants, but I'm not sure it would be terribly 14 productive or interesting at this point. 15 16 THE COURT: Thank you. MS. STRIKIS: Your Honor, Silvija Strikis for 17 the Plaintiffs. 18 19 THE COURT: I didn't see you this morning. 20 MS. STRIKIS: I was not back in chambers this 21 morning. It looked like there was a relatively large 22 crowd already this morning.

THE COURT: Well, you were welcome back there. One of your colleagues was late and his explanation was that he had been taken to the airport by

23

24

25

mistake. But, you have to ask Mr. Arsenault about that.

MS. STRIKIS: I believe that was actually

accurate, Your Honor. We left the hotel at the same

time.

The Plaintiffs agree and are anxiously

awaiting Defendant's counterproposal or agreement to our

awaiting Defendant's counterproposal or agreement to our proposal. Our only concern is that the back-up tape issue which involves two separate types of back-up, e-mail back-ups which we have greater interest in and then potentially some other back-up material on tapes which we have only potentially a focused interest in, the Plaintiffs are very concerned that that process be resolved and that the fruit of the searches be produced promptly.

So, we will discuss that with Defendants hopefully in a call tomorrow and get back to the Court promptly thereafter.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MS. STRIKIS: Thank you.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Scheduling orders for the following representative trials. Again, those are going to be discussed in chambers, number 5, this morning.

So, I don't think there is any particular need to go into that at this point in time.

THE COURT: And in the event, unlikely or

otherwise, that some observers, whether they are here or not, have said: Well, what are the status of those since we look at the pretrial orders involved and we are going to roll out some orders at the end of January? I am confident and share the view of counsel from both sides that the focus has been on the Duron case, and that once we get these set up, I mean, they are all close to being finished, as I understand it. And I don't think that anyone is concerned, that I am aware of, that there is anything happening with respect to these orders that is going to delay the existing schedule. So, I haven't heard that from anyone from either side. So --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Right. We are fully committed to that course of action. And I think that is the message from the Plaintiffs' side that we are going to be trying these cases, barring any other resolution in July of this year, and then followed by the other cases as the Court so ordered.

The only other minor issue, Your Honor, is the defendant fact sheet issue, which we discussed. And it is my understanding based on commitments from defense counsel, that approximately 153, 150 will be filed by Friday.

THE COURT: Defendant or plaintiff?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Defendant fact sheets. I beg your pardon. Plaintiffs are doing great on their fact sheets. They fabulously have complied with that. But, the Defendants are struggling a little bit. But, we are keeping the heat on, and we understand they will be filed, 150 or so that are due in February will be filed by Friday. And we will keep close tabs on that and report to the Court if there are any problems. But, it is moving along pretty efficiently.

Andy, do you have anything?

MR. CARPENTER: Sure, I can give you a little more detail.

As Mr. Zimmerman related, Mr. Goldser sent us a letter detailing the amount of defendant fact sheets they believe to be currently in arrears. We have taken a look at those numbers. We will respond in writing. We will get the defendant fact sheets that are due pushed out. I believe we are planning on producing approximately 152 of them. And this Friday is our target date.

The additional ones cited by Mr. Goldser, four of them are from cases that have been dismissed, 43 have no due date yet because our records indicate they are not substantially completed. Five have been previously produced. 56 of those are due in March by

our records. 14 are due in April. And seven are due in May. So, to the extent we have discrepancies about our records, we are happy to talk with Mr. Goldser and meet about this.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: The only other thing I would say, Your Honor, is we did mention this hearing date in March that you may move from 9:00 to 8:00. Just so everybody in the courtroom knows, this is the motion to dismiss the third-party payor and the Medicare Secondary Payor Act claims. And that is what is before Your Honor for hearing on March 6th.

THE COURT: Were you going to just note for the record -- I think you did by implication, there is soon to be rolled out, and I will do an order approving it, as such, a revised plaintiffs fact sheet?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. What has occurred, Your Honor, is the Plaintiffs and Defendants looked at the experience with the plaintiff fact sheets and the process of deficiencies and worked diligently together to try to come up with a more streamlined plaintiff fact sheet that better met the needs of the respective parties after some experience with the first plaintiff fact sheet. And recently, we have filed with the Court an approved revised plaintiff fact sheets which the

Court has before it for approval.

Once the Court has approved it, it will be posted. It will be the new plaintiff fact sheet or the revised plaintiff fact sheet. The PSC will e-mail everybody in the -- whose e-mail addresses we have -- saying that this is the new plaintiff fact sheet for cases now filed and per the requirement, plaintiff fact sheet filings are to use the new one once it is approved by the Court.

The intent was to make it a little more streamlined, a little more efficient, and resolve within it any ambiguities or problems we saw in the first year of the litigation with regard to the original fact sheet.

And I am here to say, they weren't significant, but we felt it could be improved. And we did try and improve it. And we hope the Court does find it to be an improvement.

THE COURT: My understanding is, and I can't really hold anybody to this, I guess, but I don't think there is an issue, is if these fact sheets cross in the night or in the mail or in the e-mail, my understanding was that Guidant will continue to accept the properly filled out former fact sheet. So, if they rolled in here, they won't be returned if it is properly filled

```
1
    out saying, well, there is a new one. We want the new
2
    one filled out.
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Right, we discussed that.
 3
4
    And because some of the original fact sheets are still
    in process and may be around for signature and complete
5
    fill out, they may come in at the same time as the
6
7
    revised has been approved. And there will not be a need
8
    to change your original fact sheet to a revised fact
    sheet, even though the date of filing of that fact sheet
9
10
    is after the date of entry of the new revised plaintiff
11
    fact sheet.
                MR. PRATT: That certainly is acceptable to
12
13
    the Defendant, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right.
14
15
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, that does
16
    conclude the matters we have on the formal agenda and I
17
    would ask if anyone in the courtroom has anything or Mr.
18
    Pratt?
19
                THE COURT: I'll start with Mr. Pratt, then I
20
    will -- or whomever within the group. And I will ask
21
    anyone in the courtroom.
22
                           We have nothing else, Your Honor,
                MR. PRATT:
23
    except to note -- I am kind of the numbers guy today.
24
    We have now produced to the Plaintiffs 12.7 million
```

pages of documents. So, they keep coming. And I am

25

afraid there is a little more coming.

So, we are continuing the discovery process working, I believe, well with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee to resolve disputes and get them the information that they have asked for.

THE COURT: Is there anyone else who is here who for the record wants to be heard on an issue, resolved or unresolved?

MR. BECNEL: Your Honor, once again, I would ask -- Daniel Becnel. Ask Tim Pratt -- I have a number of Minnesota cases to file, and I would ask him to allow me to file those in Federal Court rather, than me having to run back and forth between the State Court and Federal Court, just as a request, so that all would be here and I would have all of my cases in the MDL.

MR. PRATT: I'm not sure what the request is, but Mr. Becnel and I can talk about it and I am sure we can resolve it.

THE COURT: And let me -- I will say, whether it relates to the request or not, something that came up in the past two weeks, a lawyer filed a group of cases here and the request was they wanted them not to go directly into the MDL, they wanted them to go to the Panel and then sent back.

I sent the letter out, and I think it would

be accurate to say that copies were given to counsel on both sides, suggesting that if the concern is choice of law, for example, that it would be difficult for me to think that that mechanical maneuver would under any case or rule I am aware of affect what the ultimate decision would be, if that was the reason why they wanted to take them, move them out and send them back. Because they were moved directly into the MDL and were filed here and then moved in, rather than go to the Panel and come back.

And so, I don't know for certain what the concern was, but it apparently was addressed, because I think we got it resolved. And it may not be -- it may be an unrelated issue to what was raised.

Before we close --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I want to say something.

THE COURT: Mr. Zimmerman? Sorry.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I just want to inform the Court in order to be more user friendly to people who have plaintiffs' cases, we have an information line and a question and answer protocol that is being put onto the website for frequently asked questions and a direct access 800 number for people who have questions regarding PSC and the MDL process.

I wanted the Q and A, or the frequently asked

questions to be reviewed by the Court before we put it up on the website, just so there is nothing there that the Court hasn't seen. And I believe you have that in front of you.

THE COURT: I do.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And when you give us the okay, we will post that, along with the 800 number is already up for people to come into a direct communication with a person about questions they have with regard to either filing or processes or requirements or how to get orders, or things like that.

I just inform the Court of this because we try and be as user friendly to people who have cases out there as we possibly can. We do the best job we can, but there always are things we can do better, and we keep striving to do it. And these questions, frequently asked questions, is our attempt to try and improve on our processes.

THE COURT: Thank you. The other thing I was going to say, it has nothing to do directly with the MDL. I am just sorry even though they are four months ahead of schedule over in the building across the street, I may have mentioned this, but I hadn't been over there since the last hearing. Lawyers and jurors are going to find, I think, these courtrooms and their

design to be some of their most favorite and user friendly. I think I discussed in the past the design of those 8 by 10 foot screens behind the witness box and no private monitors, except for a few for offers of proof.

But now that there are the three new courtrooms that they are copying the four on the seventh floor, it is really turning out better than we could have expected. And the better part is going to be for lawyers and jurors.

And so, of course the architects and the trial experts get the credit for it, but it is too bad we can't use them starting in July because they are not that far ahead of schedule.

The GSA wouldn't let us move out of here, anyway, because we have a three-year contract. I think you are going to enjoy them very much.

Then we will, until April, we are set to return here on April 4th, and again on the 25th, not separate from the motion hearing that is set in March. And if there is any minor changes, I could move up, with the agreement of all of the parties affected, say from a 9:00 to an 8:00 start, we will get that out on the website.

I thank everyone for coming. And we are adjourned. Thank you.

1	ALL COUNSEL: Thank you.
2	(Discussion off the record.)
3	(Adjournment.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Certified by:
9	Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
10	Official Court Reporter
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	